



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Mojave Water Agency	County	San Bernardino
Project Title	County-Wide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program within San Bernardino County	Grant Request	\$ 246,961.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 246,961.00

Project Description: The project brings all groundwater basins within San Bernardino County into compliance with the California State Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) program. MWA will coordinate with other CASGEM-reporting agencies to develop a monitoring plan for unmonitored basins within the county.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	27

- **GWMP or Program:** Mojave Water Agency adopted a GWMP as part of their 2004 Regional Water Management Plan (RWMP) on February 24, 2005 (Resolution No 798-05). A copy of their resolution was provided. In addition to the RWMP, San Bernardino County adopted Ordinance 3872 to protect groundwater resources in areas not managed by other agencies within the County.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. For example, it is not entirely apparent how MWA, who is taking the lead on this project, will be coordinating with other CASGEM reporting agencies. Letters of support are provided but an explanation was missing on how they are or will communicate with these other agencies to complete the work. Also, it is stated that in addition to participation from the CASGEM reporting agencies, MWA plans on collaborating with “other water districts” and well owners where needed to obtain groundwater elevation measurements in areas they don’t currently have data; however, the applicant does not provides an explanation on how they exactly plan to do that. Also, although mentioned - “It is anticipated that each agency will fund their own efforts toward maintaining their share of the program (page 4 of Attachment 4)” – this is not an assurance, rather a very vague statement, of funding continuing on after grant funds are expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The work plan contains scheduled meetings with stakeholders, MWA staff, and the consultant that are not presented in the schedule or budget. There is no mention of quarterly reports or a final report to be submitted. There is no explanation or assurance of how access to wells will be gained for those in remote areas or that don’t qualify for Alternate Monitoring. There is mention of considering significant water users with the basin as a potential monitoring well candidate, but then it goes on to say that wells must be identified that are freely accessible for water level measurements. The applicant states that this is not a project under CEQA, but doesn’t cite the code under which they are exempt. Several of the tasks did not contain enough detail to establish this as a document that could be inserted directly into an agreement.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. A budget table was provided that shows the breakdown of project costs; however, the budget narrative is insufficient in explaining how the budget was developed. Application indicates that they would be hiring a consultant to work collaboratively with other water agencies, and San Bernardino County to complete work for his project. Yet the budget is only showing work for the consultant, not the hours for MWA and San Bernardino County. There is a column that is labeled “Other Direct Costs,” but there is no explanation or documentation to indicate what is included in those costs.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The schedule appears realistic for the proposed project. However, the information that needs to be collected - as described in the work plan – may take longer than expected. The project is assumed to start in April 2013 and will be completed by July 2014. The items in the schedule follow those presented in the work plan and budget except for the Project Management portion, which the applicant notes was not presented in the work plan. There was no discussion of how obstacles will be resolved to keep on schedule, no explanation of how the schedule was derived, and no notation of when quarterly reports and the final report will be submitted.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed but not thoroughly documented. For example, the personnel qualifications were a bit confusing. A Tony Winkel was identified as a professional engineer and a Hydrogeologist; however, only a PE certificate was provided. A statement of qualifications was provided for MWA as an agency but not the persons actually working on the project, such as, Tony Winkel and Lance Eckhart, not to mention persons from SBC who would be working on the project in conjunction with MWA.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant has grants from DWR Prop 50, USBR, and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Included in this section was a performance audit from the State Department of Finance for their Prop 50 IRWM grant, but it doesn’t give information about their performance on the grants. Though the R-cubed project will not be complete until later this year (2012), there were no progress reports or correspondence from the project manager from DWR and USBR to document performance. No supporting documentation provided regarding NRCS project and no discussion of performance.